

and the whole course of their conduct leads to the conclusion, that they considered each other as equal. Sir, while going on pursuing them in the regular turn of their proceedings, when they came to establish a Constitution, and to adopt a system of representation, which was obtained, as they supposed, for all time to come—what was the course they pursued? I refer you to the book of your own Constitution, with which every member of the Convention is familiar, and there you find whether they were large or small, with few or many in population—they all stood upon the same platform of equality—each having four representatives. Old St. Mary's then was not the diminutive St. Mary's, in point of numbers, she is now, as compared with other counties. And sir, if you look so far back as 1790, which is the first time I have been able to lay my hands upon the census of that period, for the purpose of seeing what was the relative population of the different counties of the State, you will find that with few exceptions, St. Mary's had a population equal if not larger, than most of the counties of the State. She had a population much greater than the now magnificent city of Baltimore.

CENSUS OF MARYLAND, 1790

All-gany	- - - -	4,809
Anne Arundel	- - - -	22,589
Baltimore	- - - -	25,434
Cecil	- - - -	13,625
Calvert	- - - -	8,652
Caroline	- - - -	9,506
Charles	- - - -	20,613
Dorchester	- - - -	15,875
Frederick	- - - -	30,791
Harford	- - - -	14,976
Kent	- - - -	12,836
Montgomery	- - - -	18,003
Prince George's	- - - -	21,344
Queen Anne	- - - -	15,463
St. Mary's	- - - -	15,544
Somerset	- - - -	15,610
Talbot	- - - -	13,084
Washington	- - - -	15,832
Worcester	- - - -	11,640
Baltimore city	- - - -	13,503

Population of the whole State 319,728

Gentlemen will see by reference to the census of 1790, that in the formation of the Constitution, no reference was had to population or extent of territory of the particular counties to be represented. There were certain geographical lines by which they were defined, the same as the limits and boundaries separating one State from another. And, these were intended that they might have municipal regulations; and also with a view that in selecting their representative to represent the wishes and views, and feelings of the people, they might be enabled to take them from the different sections of a county, in order that their views and feelings might be properly represented before the Legislature—for, in those days it will be recollected there were no rail roads and but few turnpikes, if any, and men had to cut their way through the woods to make a road.

And, what would now-a-days be considered almost no travel at all, that is to go from here to New York, would in former days, be regarded as a great undertaking; to travel even a few miles then was more difficult than hundreds now with the facilities that modern improvements have afforded.

I want to go on and show you that this principle, established in 1776—having had no reference at all to the number of the population in any particular county of the State, has been practised, mind you, from 1776 up to 1836, without any variation or change whatever; notwithstanding, we have had the addition of new counties, and a good many of them, for there were in 1774 but sixteen. But, whenever an addition has been made—although the county erected out of an old county, or perhaps out of two counties, had a population vastly inferior to either of the counties out of which it was erected, and also the other counties of the State; yet, when it became a county, it stood upon the same political platform as the others. The young child was put upon its feet and made to walk equally as well as the full grown man.

Sir, in 1836, a change was effected—a famous bill was passed, which was called the Reformed Constitution. (Sec. 9 relates to the number of delegates apportioned to each county and city of Baltimore. Sec. 20, ch. 197, relates to the election of Governor.)

Then, for the first time, an innovation was made. Why was it done? Was it done because any evil had grown out of the practice under the old Constitution? No, sir; no. The people were not oppressed; they were happy—every where they were prosperous, because the revolution in the money market did not occur till 1837, the year after. And, sir, I do not pretend to speak knowingly on the matter; but, perhaps, that change in 1836 might have had some effect, perhaps here at home—might have had some tendency to produce the result. But I do not believe it. Then the change took place. Well, what has been the consequence since, and why did it take place? It took place, not by the deliberative judgment of the people—with a view of remedying any evil that was known to exist, but it was, as the gentleman (I believe from Queen Anne's, Mr. GRASON, on a former occasion and upon a different subject) says, on account of a brag game which was being played between the Whigs and the Democrats in order to see which was to have the ascendancy by being the advocates of popular rights.

Each party was trying to play a brag game, and make the people believe that they were the people's friends. I do not believe there was a single man who believed that they were any more the people's friends than they were before. Not one of them. Well, a word of remark to my friend, [Mr. Brent] over the way. He said that he wanted to reply to my remarks, made before that reform was the cause of corruption in Maryland. He did not intend to be misunderstood. Gentlemen here, as in some societies, were giving in their experience. The gentleman from Baltimore city, [Mr. Fressman,] gave in his. The